

**REMARKS**

Applicants express gratitude to the Examiner for the telephonic interview on September 16, 2010. Applicants also express gratitude for the indication of allowability of claims 27, 31, and 32.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action rejections based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 14 and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

**Interview Summary**

During the interview, Applicants' representative proposed claim amendments to claims 14 and 28 based on the claim limitations that were indicated as distinguishing allowed claims 27, 31, or 32 over the cited references. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments, which have been submitted herein, appeared to overcome the cited references. The Examiner agreed to enter the amendments after final and to rejoin the withdrawn method claims.

**Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 14-18 and 20-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Asryan (U.S. 2004/0129931). Applicants submit that claims 14 and 28 have been amended to delete the term "at least one of." Accordingly, claims 14-18, 20-25, and 28 are distinguished over Asryan, which only discloses a single layer having nanostructures. Thus, as agreed upon during the telephonic interview, Applicants

respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14-18 and 20-25 be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Response to Objections

Claims 19 and 26 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would also be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants submit that claim 26 was already in independent form and thus no further amendments were necessary in this response. Claim 19 depends from claim 14, which, as amended, should be allowable as discussed during the September 16, 2010 interview. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the claim objections have been rendered moot and respectfully request that they be withdrawn.

Rejoinder of Method Claims

Method claims 28-30 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as for the structure claims. Applicants respectfully request rejoinder and allowance of the method claims.

Conclusions

In view of the above amendments and remarks hereto, Applicants believe that all of the Examiner's rejections set forth in the July 8, 2010 Office Action have been fully overcome and that the present claims fully satisfy the patent statutes. Applicants, therefore, believe that the application is in condition for allowance.

U.S. Serial No.: 10/566,431  
Attorney Docket No.: 3367-101

The Director is authorized to charge any fees or overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is deemed to expedite allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert B. Murray/  
Robert B. Murray  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 22,980  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.  
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202)783-6040  
Facsimile: (202) 783-6031

RBM/AHH  
1774672